



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,315	03/18/2004	Joshua Fagans	119-0028US	5571

29855 7590 05/14/2007  
WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI,  
L.L.P.  
20333 SH 249  
SUITE 600  
HOUSTON, TX 77070

EXAMINER

ALVESTEFFER, STEPHEN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/14/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/803,315

Applicant(s)

FAGANS, JOSHUA

Examiner

Stephen Alvesteffer

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-71 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 13, 26, 35, 43, 54, and 64 are independent claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-6, 9-12, 43-46, 49, and 50-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (hereinafter Miller), United States Patent number 6,147,703.

**Regarding claim 1**, Miller teaches a method for displaying a representation of at least one image in an application program in a computer having a graphical user interface, comprising storing at least a first image data set (higher resolution image) and a second image data set (lower resolution image) for each at least one image (see column 4 lines 42-45), wherein the first image data set (higher resolution image) is of a different resolution than the second image data set (lower resolution image); using the stored first image data set (higher resolution image) to display the at least one image in the graphical user interface (see column 7 lines 18-29); and moving the at least one displayed image using the graphical user interface, and while moving, using at least the stored second image data set (lower resolution image) to display the image in the

graphical user interface (see column 4 lines 65-67). Miller teaches that showing a lower resolution image while scrolling through higher resolution images increases the perceived speed of scrolling, and therefore it is desirable to use lower resolution images in place of higher resolution images while the images are moving on the display (see column 4 lines 42-45 and 65-67, and column 7 lines 18-29).

**Regarding claim 2**, Miller teaches that the resolution of the first image data set is higher than the resolution of the second image data set (see column 4 lines 42-45).

**Regarding claim 3**, Miller teaches that the resolution of the first image data set is determined in accordance with a magnification of the displayed at least one image (see column 4 lines 42-45). Images of higher resolution are displayed as larger pictures, i.e. pictures with greater magnification.

**Regarding claim 4**, Miller teaches moving the at least one displayed image comprises moving the at least one displayed image smoothly and continuously. When the user presses and holds a direction button, the images scroll smoothly (see column 7 lines 18-29). When the image strip reaches the end, the image strip moves continuously back to the beginning of the strip (see column 6 lines 38-43).

**Regarding claim 5**, Miller teaches that moving the at least one displayed image comprises scrolling (see column 5 lines 19-22).

**Regarding claim 6**, Miller teaches that the at least one displayed image is moved by a user interfacing with the graphical user interface (see column 6 lines 38-46).

**Regarding claims 9 and 10**, Miller teaches prior to storing the image data sets, processing the at least one image to form the image data sets for each at least one image; wherein the processing occurs when the at least one image is associated with the application program (see column 4 lines 10-13). Miller's invention captures real-world images, then must process the images to digitize them and store them as image data sets on the device, where it is associated with the device's previewing software.

**Regarding claim 11**, Miller teaches that the stored image data sets are transferred to the application program (see column 8 lines 26-42). The act of capturing the real-world images transfers the image data sets to the camera device. The application program of Miller is the device's previewing software. The image data sets are transferred to the application program when the user attempts to preview the images stored on the device.

**Regarding claim 12**, Miller teaches that at least one of the first and second image data sets for each at least one image comprises a full resolution version of the image (see column 5 lines 56-67). The higher resolution image of Miller is the full resolution version of the image.

**Claims 43-46 and 50-53** recite a computer-readable medium with substantially the same limitations as the method of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, and 9-11, respectively. Therefore, claims 43-46 and 50-53 are rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding claim 49**, the images of Miller are processed and loaded by the program (see column 4 lines 52-54).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7, 8, 13-23, 24-42, 47, 48, 54-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (6,147,703) *supra* and Anderson, United States Patent number 6,215,523.

**Regarding claim 7**, Miller teaches all the limitations of claim 7 but is silent on the limitation of at least one of the first or second image data sets for each at least one image is in a memory mapped format. Anderson teaches a similar invention providing more efficient scrolling of preview images on a camera device, and also explicitly teaches that the images are in memory mapped format (see column 14 lines 26-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use memory mapped format with the images because there must be a way to associate the low resolution images with the high resolution images on the device.

**Regarding claim 8**, Miller teaches all the limitations of claim 8, but is silent on the limitation that at least one of the first or second image data sets for each at least one image is uncompressed. Once again, Anderson teaches a similar invention, but also explicitly teaches that the lower resolution images may be uncompressed (see column 7 lines 52-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the invention of Anderson with the

invention of Miller for the purpose of taking advantage of the efficiency gained in not having to decompress the images before they are displayed.

**Claims 13-23 and 25** have substantially the same limitations as claims 1-12, respectively, except that claims 13-23 and 25 recite the invention as comprising at least three or more image data sets for each of a plurality of images, whereas claims 1-12 recite the invention as comprising at least a first image data set and a second image data set for each at least one image. Claims 1-12 have been established as fully anticipated by either Miller alone, or the combination of Miller and Anderson. Anderson further teaches that three image data sets are used – a thumbnail image, a scrennail image, and the compressed image data (see column 7 lines 32-39). Because the inventions of Anderson and Miller are very similar, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to combine the invention taught by Anderson with the invention taught by Miller to arrive at the instant invention as recited in claims 13-23 and 25.

**Regarding claim 24**, the combination of Anderson and Miller as discussed previously teaches all the limitations of claim 24 except that the queried image data sets for each of the plurality of images depends on a speed at which the plurality of images are moved. Miller teaches that some users may wish to scroll the images at a faster speed than the system can display the lower resolution images. Miller's solution to this problem is to allow a second, faster scrolling speed where only the image frames are shown along with a few interspersed lower resolution images (see column 7 lines 37-47). However, both of Miller's scroll speeds use the same lower resolution images.

Art Unit: 2173

Anderson teaches the use of three different resolutions of images (see column 7 lines 32-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Anderson with the teachings of Miller in order to handle multiple scrolling speeds when previewing the images.

**Claim 26** recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claim 13, except that claim 26 recites a limitation of selecting one of a plurality of magnification levels. Anderson teaches that the camera device has zoom features, which allows for the magnification of the images (see column 6 lines 43-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate zoom features in digital camera device software in order to allow users to view captured images at different resolutions.

**Claims 27-31 and 34** recite a method with substantially the same limitations as claims 19-23 and 25, respectively. Therefore, claims 27-31 and 34 are rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding claims 32 and 33**, there can inherently be a number of magnification levels included in the camera zoom features that are either the same or different than the number of image data sets used by the camera device software.

**Claim 35** recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claim 13. Therefore, claim 35 is rejected under the same rationale.

**Claims 36 and 37** recite a method with substantially the same limitations as claim 19. Therefore, claims 36 and 37 are rejected under the same rationale.



**Claims 38 and 39** recite a method with substantially the same limitations as claim 20. Therefore, claims 38 and 39 are rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding claims 40 and 42**, the inventions of both Miller and Anderson are inherently embodied in an application program on the camera device, and the images are inherently loaded into the application program on the camera device. Anderson explicitly mentions a "computer-readable program instructions to control the operation of camera" (see column 4 lines 56-59).

**Claim 41** recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claim 25 of the instant application. Therefore, claim 41 is rejected under the same rationale.

**Claims 47 and 48** recite a computer-readable medium with substantially the same limitations as claims 7 and 8. Therefore, claims 47 and 48 are rejected under the same rationale.

**Claims 54-63** recite a computer-readable medium with substantially the same limitations as claims 26-28, 40, 32-34, and 29-31, respectively. Therefore, claims 54-63 are rejected under the same grounds.

**Claims 64-71** recite a computer-readable medium with substantially the same limitations as claims 35-42. Therefore, claims 64-71 are rejected under the same grounds.


**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Alvesteffer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571)272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Stephen Alvesteffer  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2173



JOHN CABECA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

SA  
5-8-2007